

A. KINGSMAN et al.
Application No.: 10/016,686
Page 4

PATENT

REMARKS

Claim 60 has been revised to clarify the subject matter of the claim as previously presented. The revision to part "a)" of the claim is supported at least on page 20, third paragraph, of the instant specification. The change to part "b)" of the claim clarifies that the complementary strand of part "a)" does not encode a binding protein. This change is supported by part "b" as previously presented, in which the last "wherein" clause only applied to part "b)".

No new matter has been introduced, and entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Acknowledgements

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of the correction of inventorship and the spelling of the last name of co-inventor Carroll.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 52-54, 57, 61, 63, 65, 66, and 68 are allowable.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claim 60 and claims dependent therefrom were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite for reciting "stringent conditions". Applicants have revised the claim as presented above to use alternative language in relation to the hybridization conditions. The new language is believed to be clear and definite to the artisan in light of the specification, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

Claim 60 and claims dependent therefrom were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph as allegedly non-enabling because "[i]t is not possible for the nucleic acid that hybridizes to SEQ ID NO:5 coding strand to encode a ScFv that binds 5T4 antigen. It is also known that one could not produce a ScFv with just any DNA that hybridizes to or is complementary to the DNA of SEQ ID NO:5."

A. KINGSMAN et al.
Application No.: 10/016,686
Page 5

PATENT

Applicants have carefully reviewed the statement of the instant rejection and respectfully traverse because no *prima facie* case of undue experimentation has been presented.

As presented above, claim 60 has been amended to clarify that the sequence complementary to the SEQ ID NO:5 coding strand does not have the requirement of encoding a ScFv that binds 5T4. Applicants believe that this change does not alter the scope of part "b" in claim 60 as previously presented, in which the last "wherein" clause only applied to part "b)".


Moreover, Applicants point out that part "a)" of claim 60 has been revised to recite "conditions of high stringency". Accordingly, only those sequences that have a high degree of complementarity with SEQ ID NO:5 are encompassed because only specific hybridization between target and probe will persist. In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant rejection may be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully urge passage of the instant application to issue.

If the Examiner believes a telephonic discussion would expedite prosecution of this application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,


Kawai Lau, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 44,461

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: (858) 350-6151
Fax: (415) 576-0300

60365918 v1